

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 23

December 4, 2018

243 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Adkins v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 946 . . . . .	46
Breton v. Commissioner of Correction, 330 C 462 . . . . .	2
<i>Habeas corpus; risk reduction credit; claim that 2013 amendment (P.A. 13-3, § 59) to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-125a) governing parole eligibility, as applied retroactively to petitioner; violated ex post facto clause of United States constitution on ground that it increased amount of time that he would be required to serve before becoming eligible for parole; whether ex post facto clause barred respondent from applying 2013 amendment to petitioner; whether 2013 amendment created sufficient risk that petitioner would be incarcerated longer than he would have been under version of § 54-125a in effect when petitioner committed crimes for which he was incarcerated.</i>	
Farrell v. Johnson & Johnson (Order), 330 C 944. . . . .	44
Garner v. Commissioner of Correction, 330 C 486 . . . . .	26
<i>Habeas corpus; risk reduction credit; claim that 2013 amendment (P.A. 13-3, § 59) to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-125a) governing parole eligibility, as applied retroactively to petitioner; violated ex post facto clause of United States constitution on ground that it increased amount of time that he would be required to serve before becoming eligible for parole; whether ex post facto clause barred respondent from applying 2013 amendment to petitioner; petitioner's ex post facto claim controlled by this court's decision in Breton v. Commissioner of Correction (330 Conn. 462); claim that petitioner's counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to arrange for petitioner's cousin to speak on petitioner's behalf at sentencing hearing in mitigation of petitioner's sentence; whether counsel's performance was deficient.</i>	
Gonzalez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 947 . . . . .	47
Jenkins v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 949 . . . . .	49
Langston v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 946 . . . . .	46
Lindsay v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 947 . . . . .	47
Roberson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 330 C 948 . . . . .	48
State v. Carney (Order), 330 C 945 . . . . .	45
State v. Ezequiel R. R. (Order), 330 C 945 . . . . .	45
State v. Meadows (Order), 330 C 947. . . . .	47
State v. Papantoniou (Order), 330 C 948 . . . . .	48
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	51

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bonilla v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 186 CA 901 . . . . .	173A
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction, 186 CA 332 . . . . .	36A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly dismissed claim that amendments to risk reduction earned credits statute (§ 18-98e) violated ex post facto clause of federal constitution; claim that petitioner's guilty plea in underlying criminal case was not knowingly and voluntarily made; whether habeas court properly dismissed third habeas petition without hearing on ground that it lacked jurisdiction; whether habeas court properly dismissed challenge to voluntariness of guilty plea as improper successive claim pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-29); claim that petitioner's loss of risk reduction earned credits was cognizable liberty interest; whether claim in third habeas petition that guilty plea was invol-</i>	

(continued on next page)

- untary was precluded by collateral estoppel; whether claim was fully and fairly litigated and decided adversely to petitioner.*
- Bruno v. Whipple, 186 CA 299 . . . . . 3A
- Contracts; hearing in damages; claim that trial court improperly concluded that plaintiff failed to prove actual damages; claim that trial court exceeded scope of remand order; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff did not prove that marital estate was reduced by defendant's breach of contract was clearly erroneous; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff had not met burden in demonstrating entitlement to claimed damages; whether plaintiff's claims were based on conjecture and speculation; whether failure of trial court to award nominal damages and to render judgment in favor of plaintiff on breach of contract count constituted reversible error; whether general rule that appellate court will not reverse judgment of trial court for mere failure to award nominal damages applied.*
- Davis v. Commissioner of Correction, 186 CA 366 . . . . . 70A
- Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal from judgment denying habeas petition; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel rendered effective assistance; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to move to preclude firearm related evidence; claim that trial counsel was ineffective in failing to consult with and to present testimony of eyewitness identification expert; claim that trial counsel was deficient in failing to object to testimony of laboratory supervisor on ground that testimony violated petitioner's right to confrontation under federal constitution; claim that trial counsel was ineffective by failing to prepare petitioner for presentence investigation interview.*
- LeSueur v. LeSueur, 186 CA 431 . . . . . 135A
- Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to modify child support; whether there was legally proper evidentiary basis before trial court to support determination of plaintiff's gross or net weekly income at time it considered motions for modification; whether trial court may include income from alimony when it calculates income of alimony recipient for purposes of determining child support; claim that error was harmless and had de minimis impact on trial court's order that plaintiff pay weekly child support; whether error was harmful; claim that trial court abused its discretion by terminating defendant's child support obligation retroactively; whether trial court lacked sufficient information to calculate parties' financial circumstances; whether there was evidence in record indicating that plaintiff's financial circumstances had changed; whether plaintiff demonstrated that she required child support in order to provide for necessary expenses of parties' son; claim that trial court misconstrued parties' separation agreement; whether trial court properly determined that provision of agreement regarding cap and tuition limit of four year college degree from Connecticut state university system did not apply because parties and parties' children mutually agreed on postsecondary institutions that children would attend; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to modify unallocated alimony and child support; claim that because trial court determined that reduction in*

(continued on next page)

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications  
Office of Production and Distribution  
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453  
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178  
[www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov)

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

*Published Weekly* – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by  
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*  
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

<i>plaintiff's salary constituted substantial change in circumstances, trial court was obligated to consider all statutory (§ 46b-82) factors to order alimony in accordance with needs and financial resources of parties; whether trial court needed to make explicit reference to statutory criteria that it considered in making its decision.</i>	
Nicholson v. Commissioner of Correction, 186 CA 398 . . . . .	102A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion by denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance; claim that trial counsel was ineffective by failing to present testimony of expert witness; claim that habeas court abused its discretion by declining to treat witness as expert; whether trial counsel's decision not to retain expert constituted reasonable tactical decision; whether applicable provision (§ 7-2) of Connecticut Code of Evidence required explicit offer and acceptance of witness as expert in order for witness to be treated as expert witness; whether petitioner demonstrated error was harmful; claim that habeas court abused its discretion by failing to review certain evidence admitted at habeas trial.</i>	
State v. Barjon, 186 CA 320 . . . . .	24A
<i>Robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; robbery in second degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in second degree; whether trial court violated defendant's right to conflict free representation by not inquiring into potential conflict prior to defendant's plea canvass; claim that once pretrial discussion of plea being accepted by defendant broke down and case was placed on trial list, trial court should have known of conflict of interest and inquired about it on record; claim that trial court erred in assuming that potential conflict issues had been resolved; claim that fact that defendant was prepared to make statement to his detriment and to benefit of codefendant indicated conflict requiring reversal; reviewability of claim that when pretrial counsel withdrew from representation, subsequent counsel did not have adequate time to interview witnesses and to conduct investigation of case.</i>	
State v. Davis, 186 CA 385 . . . . .	89A
<i>Violation of probation; motion to dismiss; motion for continuance; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction due to allegedly improper transfer of case to Superior Court in Bridgeport; whether claim that Bridgeport Superior Court lacked jurisdiction over probation revocation proceeding was essentially objection to venue rather than to jurisdiction; whether claim of improper venue is procedural in nature; whether trial court abused its discretion in granting public defender's transfer request; claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional right to be present at critical stage of probation revocation proceeding; whether state demonstrated harmlessness of any claimed error beyond reasonable doubt; claim that trial court improperly denied request for continuance of dispositional phase of probation revocation proceeding until all pending criminal matters were resolved to protect defendant's right of allocution; State v. Blake (289 Conn. 586) discussed.</i>	
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Wolf (Memorandum Decision), 186 CA 902 . . . . .	174A
Volume 186 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	175A

## NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Summaries . . . . .	1B
---------------------	----